



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—*Notes on Latin Quantity.*

BY TRACY PECK,

PROFESSOR IN YALE COLLEGE.

IN recent discussions of the "Roman" method of pronouncing Latin, the quantitative feature in that method has been made perhaps unwarrantably prominent and formidable. Advocates of that method have spoken of a ratio of two to one as subsisting between long and short vowels, and have proposed elaborate devices for realizing this ratio: opponents of that method have naturally made the most of the great difficulty—if not absolute impossibility—of naturalizing so foreign and exact a system, and have further emphasized the fact that we are and always must be ignorant of the natural length of many vowels. But, if these assumptions and inferences were well authenticated, if our ignorance of the ancient pronunciation of Latin were greater than it really is, and if our capacity and facilities for grappling with the inherent difficulties of the problem were far less than they really are, there would still be no reasonable ground for regarding either with detraction or with discouragement those who are laboring conscientiously and intelligently toward a restored pronunciation. Few indeed are the matters of faith or practice in which more can be hoped for than a near and nearer approach to the absolute truth; and the scholar who has not the steadily inquiring mind, and the ready courage to adopt the solid results of scientific research, may well look to his credentials. It need be a reproach to no reform if it fall short of the ideals which are set up by its antagonists or by its own zealous champions.

But is there any evidence that the Romans, in the ordinary use of their language, practically recognized the mathematical ratio referred to? And unless such evidence is abundant and conclusive, are there not strong *a priori* presumptions against the view, in the matter-of-fact character of the Roman people,

and in the very nature of the question at issue? The tragedian Accius—who was a grammarian and purist as well—did indeed propose that long vowels be doubled in writing, as *aara*, *leege*, *luuci*; but perhaps this proposal favors rather the view that the every-day use of the language tended so to obliterate the distinction between long and short vowels that such graphical devices were resorted to by the doctrinaires. At any rate the device was but little used and was opposed by the satirist Lucilius. Then the attempt was made to stamp long vowels in the text by a superscribed mark called *apex*: but there was no popular acceptance of this, and in the extant vestiges of it, as in the Monumentum Ancyranum, there is no consistency in its employment. Quintilian (IX. 4, 47) says: “Longam syllabam esse duorum temporum, breuem unius, etiam pueri sciunt:” but it is of facts in verse composition with reference to rhythmical prose that Quintilian is here speaking, and after he has said all, he seems to feel that much attention to such matters was an unwholesome symptom, and (IX. 4, 142) he frankly concedes that a harsh and vigorous manner of speech was better than the emasculate fashion which reminded him of dancing to the most wanton music. And in Cicero’s discussions of prose-rhythm it clearly appears that many of his contemporaries regarded the whole subject as puerile, finical, un-Roman.

Apart from these quasi-exceptions I find nothing in the writings of the classical period which supports the dogma that the quantity of Latin vowels was, in practice, peculiarly precise or exacting. But, as this is only negative, it may be of advantage if we group together some facts in the development and experience of the language, the cumulative force of which justifies us in believing that those who used Latin for the ordinary social purposes allowed themselves great latitude in the quantitative utterance of its vowels. Of course it is not meant that the Romans were practically ignorant or heedless in this matter: every line in classical Latin poetry is constructed with reference to a recognizable difference, in time, between long and short vowels, as are many of the sentences and periods of the masters of Latin prose, and we lose much of the music

and rhythm of all good Latin style if we ourselves ignore those subtle and alternating differences to which the Roman ear was so sensitive.

Naturally the illustrations must be mainly drawn from poetry; but what is true of those who used the artificial and imported systems of verse that prevailed in Rome, must be true *a fortiori* of those who talked prose. As scholars are still at issue in regard to some of the metrical principles of Plautus and Terence, very limited use will be made of these writers, though more than any others they confirm all that will be said, and though the language of their plays seems to be an almost perfect representation of the language of Rome's best society. Aelius Stilo—Rome's earliest scientific philologist, and the teacher of Varro and Cicero—said that the Muses, if they had wished to talk Latin, would have used the speech of Plautus, and the many enthusiastic and discriminating praises which the ancients paid to the diction of Terence are summed up in Caesar's phrase—*puri sermonis amator*.

First of all, the variation in the quantity of final vowels is noticeable. Remains of early Latin and the corresponding forms in cognate languages show that Latin was originally burdened with long final vowels. The tendency to shorten such vowels appears with the appearance of the literature. Latin speakers had developed a system by which the accent was drawn back from the ultima; this fact and the natural economical tendency to hurry over all syllables, except those which were radical or emphasized, greatly facilitated the disintegrating process. Then with Ennius, the introduction of a foreign structure of verse, and widening interest in Greek, a check was given to this tendency. But the struggle went on till finally, under the Emperors, the guiding principle in Latin versification was accent, as distinguished from quantity.

That final *a* was long in the nom. sing. of the first declension is seen from its occasional occurrence in earlier inscriptions and in Plautus, from the archaic gen.-*āī*, as well as from the corresponding forms in Sanskrit and Greek. Final *o* in verbs was originally long, and this is its usual length in the poets of the Republic; but there are exceptions on every

hand, and in the poetry of the Silver Age it is prevailingly short. *O* was thus freely treated at the end of nouns, pronouns, numerals, and adverbs, as, *uirgō*, *egō*, *octō*, *citō*; in fact, no limit was set to the shortening of final *o* except at the dat. and abl. of the second decl., and even this limit was transgressed as early as Seneca (*uincendō*, Tr. 273: *lugendō*, Herc. O. 1867) and Juvenal (*uigilandō*, III. 232). In every-day adverbs and verb-forms final *e* was shortened regularly or at the pleasure of the poet, as, *benē*, *cauē* and, in Martial (XI. 108), *saluē*. In the regular work of the language it is not credible that *mihi*, *tibi*, *sibi*, *ibi*, and *ubi* could exclusively treat final *i* as "common." In Plautus, according to the best authorities, many original and ordinary iambs become pyrrhics; as, *rogā*, *docē*, *abī*, *bonō*, *manū*: and in Plautus and Terence many long vowels—not themselves final, but in final syllables—are shortened; as, *forās*, *bonīs*, *uirōs*. The precarious hold which final *s* had on distinct enunciation doubtless helped this tendency. Here belongs the long list of nouns of the third decl. whose abl. sing. ends in *ī* or *ē*, as *marī* and *marē*. Quintilian speaks (I. 4, 8: I. 7, 24) of the *medius quidam sonus* of final *i*.

In all Latin poetry, syllables which are ordinarily short are sometimes made long. The habit of ascribing such deviations from the prevailing usage to the effect of the metrical ictus, or to poetic license, is indolent and explains nothing. The older poets, as Ennius, Plautus, Lucilius, naturally recognized the quantity which was historically more correct and was still heard all about them; later poets might well imitate even the exceptional usages of their forerunners, though it is very doubtful if they would have gone beyond what was at least sometimes heard from the best speakers. Such abnormal lengths do occur much more frequently in the thesis of the foot, and either before a caesura or a pause in the thought—where the exceptional measurement is less observed. But they also occur in the arsis, and perhaps only where it cannot be shown that the vowel was once long should the rarer length be charged to thesis. Nor is "poetic license" the talisman to which recourse can here or elsewhere be duly had. The Roman poets were certainly sometimes perplexed in their

endeavor to fit the Latin vocabulary to the molds of Greek verse, and they now and then helped themselves on by heroic remedies; but we must protest against the notion that such consummate artists in expression and such careful metrists as Lucretius and Catullus and Vergil and Horace would have allowed themselves to use forms and sounds which were not recognized as correct by the cultivated circles in which they moved. Vergil's metrical treatment of the enclitic *que* is peculiar and suggestive. Sixteen times he lengthens the vowel of this little word. Possibly, with his antiquarian taste, he felt that he was using the original quantity of the vowel; probably he was affected by the Homeric treatment of $\tau\epsilon$, and perhaps a fondness for greatly varying his music was present here, too. Repeatedly in Vergil (*e. g.* A. III. 91), as in Ovid (M. X. 262), *que* is both long and short in the same line.

Final vowels were not merely thus freely lengthened or shortened; they sometimes vanished altogether. Literary documents have transmitted to us but five apocopated imperatives (*dic, duc, fac, fer, inger*), but these exist side by side with the longer forms, and are in all probability types of a wide usage. The same remark applies to the contracted adverbial expressions *magnopere* and *tantopere*, and the genitives and vocatives of the second declension from nominatives in *-ius*. Gellius devotes a chapter (IX. 14) to showing, by citations from numerous authors, that the gen. and dat. of the fifth declension often ended in *-e* or *-i*, instead of in *-eī*. Colloquial forms like *uin, satin, uiden*, are instructive here, as well as in regard to the sound of final *s* and the free movement of the accent. Ennius reduced *caelum, domum* and *gaudium* to the grotesque forms *cael, do*, and *gau*. Perhaps hypermetrical verses—especially where the concurrent lines divide the thought—may be explained as instances of apocope, or as quasi-absorption of the supernumerary into the next preceding syllable. Full of suggestive interest is Quintilian's statement (XI. 3, 33, 34): "*dilucida uero erit pronuntiatio primum si uerba tota exierint, quorum pars deuorari, pars destitui solet, plerisque extremas syllabas non perferentibus dum priorum sono indulget: ut est autem necessaria uerborum explanatio,*

ita omnes imputare et uelut adnumerare litteras molestum et odiosum; nam et uocales frequentissime coeunt et consonantium quaedam insequente uocali dissimulantur." This important passage shows that the avoidance of hiatus, by the quick half-pronunciation of contiguous vowels in different words, obtained in conversation as well as in poetry. Cicero (Or. 44, 150; 45, 152) speaks of the extreme sensitiveness of the Romans in this particular, and tells us that not to combine sounds was a mark of boorishness, and that, whatever the Greeks might do, the Romans were not allowed to keep their words apart. According to Seneca (Ep. 40) some refused to call Vinicius eloquent because he could not fuse together three words. Cicero (de Div. II. 40) states that when Crassus was leaving Italy on his unfortunate expedition, the cry of the vender of figs from Caunus — *Cauneas* — might have been understood as the ominous warning, *Caue ne eas!*

The terms by which this frequent synalepha is referred to (*contrahere, coagmentare, coniungere, coire, conglutinatio*) seem to show that it was not so much a suppression of one sound as the coalescence of two sounds into one—a genuine diphthongal result. Noteworthy in verse are the different effects of synalepha: sometimes a long final vowel before an initial vowel is left intact; sometimes it is treated as a short vowel; sometimes it appears to be entirely sacrificed.

But variation in and total extinction of quantity affect medial as well as final vowels. Martial (IX. 11), expressing regret that he cannot adjust 'Earinos' to his hendecasyllabic verse without taking liberties with the first vowel, states that the Greeks can say *Ᾱpes Ᾱpes*, but that such freedom is not allowed those who cultivate the stricter Latin Muses. But such liberties do run like a thread through all Latin poets, Martial included, and in him alone (V. 11) is found the bold measurement *smaragdus*. Usually in verse, *pro*, in composition, is consistently long or consistently short; but in many words it is either long or short with apparent lawlessness. In Lucretius we find *prōpagare* five times, *prōpagare* twice. At VI. 1027 he measures *prōpellat*, but two lines later, *prōpellat*. For the noun *propago* Vergil has the *o* long (G. II. 26), and

short (A. VI. 870). In Martial occur *prōpino* (I. 68) and *prōpino* (II. 15). There is the same, though less extended, fitfulness with *re* in compounds, as, *rēcido*, *rēduco*, *rēlatum*, *rēligio*. The poets seem to have found a peculiar pleasure in playing with quantities when a word is soon repeated; thus, in the same line, *līquidīs*, *līquida* (Lucr. IV. 1259), *ubī*, *ubī* (Tib. II. 3, 27), *tibī*, *tibī* (Mart. I. 36, 1), *captō*, *captō* (id. II. 18, 1), *ōhe*, *ōhe* (id. IV. 89, 1), and *ēois*, *ēois* (Prop. II. 3, 43, 44). The same fancy is noticeable where a naturally short vowel precedes a mute and a liquid, as, *pātribus*, *pātres* (Lucr. IV. 1222), *pātris*, *pātrum* (Verg. A. II. 663), *nīgris*, *nīgro* (Hor. O. I. 32, 11), *uolūcri*, *uolūcres* (Ov. M. XIII. 607). Lachmann (Lucr. I. 360) gives quite a catalogue and discussion of words with biquantal vowels, as, *cōturnix*, *glōmus*, *līquor*, *rūdo*, *uācillo*. When a long radical vowel is short in derivatives, the shifting of the accent is often said to explain the change in quantity, as, *ācer ācerbus*, *diū diūturnus*, *lūceo lūcerna*, *mōles mōlestus*, *pūsio pūsillus*, *offa ōfella*, *scribo conscribillo*: accent may perhaps be here recognized as one of the factors, but accent cannot explain the varying length in such congeners as *dūx dūco*, *fīdes fīdus*, *lēx lēgo*, *sēdeo sēdes*, *stātio stāmen*, *tēgo tēgula*, *uōx uōco*. A short penult occurs here and there in all styles in the third plural of the perfect active, and in the first five lines of the sixth book of Lucretius—a very carefully elaborated passage—we find this almost bewildering variety of forms and quantities: — *dididērunt*, *recreauērunt*, *rogārunt*, *dedērunt*, *genuēre*.

This licentious treatment of the medial vowel sometimes went to its complete extrusion. No account is here made of the many syncopated forms which appear to have become fixed before the literary period, as *disciplina* (*discipulina*), *templum* (*tempulum*), *gigno* (*gigeno*), *publicus* (*populicus*), *alumnus* (*aluminus*). In some of these there lingered on an apparent consciousness of the original longer form: thus, *dextera* and *dextra*, *supera* and *supra* exist together. Lucretius uses *saeculum* forty times, and uniformly as a dissyllable; in Catullus the same word is six times a dissyllable, once a trisyllable; Vergil and other poets are less uniform. Not

unfrequently the penultimate vowel is dropped from *circulus*, *periculum*, *oraculum*, *uinculum*, and others like them. *Solidus* and *soldus*, *ualide* and *ualde* exist side by side. Augustus, who was exceptionally careful with his Latin, corrected (Quint. I. 6, 19) his grandson for preferring *calidus* to *caldus*, and the emperor's reason is well worth quoting: "non quia id non sit Latinum, sed quia sit odiosum et, ut ipse Graeco uerbo significauit, *περίεργον*." The schoolmaster Quintilian (I. 6, 17) charges "molestissima diligentiae peruersitas" upon those who would say *audaciter* rather than *audacter*. Here belong the syncopated verbal forms like *postus*, *replictus*, *tristi*, *consumpse*, *promisse*, *surrexe*. Of considerable value is the fact that such contractions occur with quite unusual frequency in the satires of Horace. These compositions, Horace insists, are but 'familiar talks' (*sermones*); they certainly and intentionally lack the poetic dignity and curious and varied music of his other works. According to Aulus Gellius (XIX. 7), Laevius said *oblitteram* instead of *oblitteratam*, and the Romance languages are full of analogous mutilations or substitutions. In Lucretius are many sporadic cases of contraction, as *coplata*, *probeo* (*prohibeo*), *unorsum*, *singlariter*, and — probably without a parallel in classical meter — *ōriūdi* (II. 991). As Lucretius was a didactic poet, passionately endeavoring to win men to his master's philosophy, is it to be supposed that he would have thus used his language if thereby his readers would have been offended? The easy merging of two or three concurrent Latin vowels into a single vocal result explains forms like *amasti*, *nolo* (*neuolo*), *prosa* (*prouersa*), *prudens*, and perhaps *praeco* (*praeuoco*), *decuria* (*decuuiria*). The statelier verse presents *auunculus* as a quadrisyllable; in Plautine scansion it is a trisyllable, and its reduction to the mere diminutive ending in the descendants and cognates of Latin (oncle, Onkel, etc.) suggests how the word may have been familiarly pronounced. Under this head reference may be made to the equivalent endings in *-um* and *-ium* for the gen. plural of the third declension, as *apum apium*, *dentum dentium*, and also to synizesis, as *rēi*, *quoad*, *eius*, *suo*, *deorum*, *alueo*, *ostrēa*.

Less frequent, but found in perhaps all poets, is a change

in the standard number of syllables in a word when the elements of a diphthong are individualized, or when a consonant is vocalized or a vowel consonantized, as *aquā*, *cōēpi*, *suādent*, *suēsse*, *peruoluō*, *siluā*, and *gēnuā*, *tēnuis*, *flūuīdorum*, *ābiēte*, *con-sīlūm*. In most of these examples the aggregate quantity continues the same after the transformation; in others, there is a change in this particular, as *omniā*, *stelīo* (Verg. G. IV. 243), *taenūs* (id. A. V. 269), *ebulliat* (Persius II. 10).

The Latin language was naturally constantly receiving Greek words into citizenship, and Quintilian's statement (I. 5, 60) is important that the strict Latin party accented Greek words after the Latin analogy, as *Castōrem*. This measurement of this particular word is not found in extant Latin poetry, but as Ennius did lengthen the penult of *Hectōris*, we have a hint as to what may have been heard in the literary clubs, and still more on the streets of Rome. In some adopted Greek words a new quantity was certainly stereotyped, as *ancōra* (ἄγκυρα), *crēpida* (κρηπίς), *platēa* (πλατεία), *prōlogus* (πρόλογος), *trūtina* (τρῦτάνη). Variations in Greek quantities were perhaps not so frequent as to have influenced the Romans, but interesting certainly are such dimetric forms as ἄνῆρ ἄνῆρ, Ἄρες Ἄρες, ἴσος ἴσος, καλός, φίλος φίλος, ἄπο-, ὦ τᾶν.

The habit of treating a large number of Latin vowels as sometimes long and sometimes short — the vowels which are, from their position, called "common" —, and the fact that the Latin had not, like the Greek, the great advantage of separate characters for long and short vowels, must, it seems to me, have led to very frequent inconsistency in the time of uttering vowels not "common" by position.

When the vowel of a syllable long by position is itself long by nature, is it likely that the Romans in reading poetry practically paid much heed to this natural length? Catullus's Fourth Poem and its parody, in one of the minor poems ascribed to Vergil, are almost the sole specimens of entire poems in unadulterated iambic verse, and something of the rippling melody, of the clearly intended musical effect of these exquisite pieces seems to me to vanish, if we give more than the barest recognition to the long vowels imbedded in conso-

nants. And the same remark applies to no small part of the best Latin poetry.

In Aulus Gellius there are several chapters (II. 17: IV. 17: VII. 15: IX. 6: XII. 3) which tell of animated discussions among the grammarians and literary men of his time in regard to the proper length of many vowels, as of the *o* of *pro* in composition, the *a* in certain frequentatives like *actito*, the *e* in *quiesco*, the vowel of the preposition that is compounded with *iacio*. And if in these fragments—this dust, rather—that we have received of the ancient literature we discover clear evidences of disagreement in the theory and practice of the educated circles, what are we to infer as to the latitude of usage among the ordinary users of the Latin speech?

IV.—*The Influence of the Latin Syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.*¹

By W. B. OWEN.

PROFESSOR IN LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

I TAKE the following passage from the introduction to Professor March's Anglo-Saxon Grammar. "The Anglo-Saxon was shaped to literary use by men who wrote and spoke Latin, and thought it an ideal language; and a large part of the literature is translated or imitated from Latin authors. It is not to be doubted, therefore, that the Latin exercised a great influence on the Anglo-Saxon: if it did not lead to the introduction of wholly new forms, either of etymology or syntax, it led to the extended and uniform use of those forms which are like the Latin, and to the disuse of others, so as to draw the grammars near each other." In going over one of the Anglo-Saxon gospels for another purpose, I incidentally noted a few points which aptly verify this opinion.

Just when and by whom these gospels were translated is not known; it seems probable, however, that they were taken

¹ The remarks in this paper are confined to Matthew and Mark.